

**INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES**

2006-2007 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT

FOR:

Ace It! Tutoring

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
Tutor Qualifications		Lesson matches original description	Satisfactory	Criminal Background Checks	
Recruiting Materials		Instruction is clear	Satisfactory	Health/safety laws & regulations	
Academic Program		Time on task is appropriate	Satisfactory	Financial viability	
Progress Reporting		Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	Satisfactory		
		Student/instructor ratio: 3:1	Satisfactory		

ACTION NEEDED: NONE

(As per the on-site monitoring rubric instructions, while monitoring/ observation of SES providers is completed annually, document and compliance analysis is completed every two years. Since Ace It!'s document and compliance analysis was completed during the 2005-2006 school year, only an observation was completed for the 2006-2007 school year).

On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Ace It! Tutoring
SITE: 544 Conkey Street Ace It! Office (Hammond, IN)
TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED): 2 tutors
NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED: 2

DATE: March 28, 2007
REVIEWERS: MC/ST
TIME OF OBSERVATION: 5:10PM

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a mark of “Satisfactory” (S) or “Unsatisfactory” (U) for each component. Providers receiving a “U” in any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	S	U	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application	X		Two small groups of students were observed working on Ace It! Curriculum language arts/reading lessons. In the first group, each student had multiple worksheets that had been prescribed for him/her by the pre-assessment. The tutor had manipulatives on the table including letter tiles and a letter board. The tutor worked among students and corrected worksheets when students were finished. On occasion, the tutor tried to help the students come up with answers on their own, but sometimes the tutor just gave them the answers (at those times, it was not always clear that students completely understood the concepts). In the second group, students also worked on workbooks and worksheets on language arts/reading on vocabulary recognition and homonyms. The students primarily worked independently but were provided with help when asked. The tutor transitioned between students. The tutor encouraged the use of manipulatives (such as the letter board) and tried to get students to come up with the answers on their own using a variety of strategies to help them understand. However, students were not always observed being asked to explain their reasoning behind answers either orally or in writing, as was described in Ace It!’s application (see below).
Instruction is clear	X		Ace It!’s application notes that “students are guided with questioning and strategy instruction” and that “students are asked to explain their thinking and answers to the class”. However, in many cases, it appeared that students were not guided to answers and instead were working independently on worksheets. In some cases, students were just given the answers when they had answered incorrectly and were not guided to understanding or were not asked to explain their thinking and answers to the class. While students did appear to know what they were supposed to be working on and did seem to have good rapport with the instructors, it did not always appear that strategies such as those described in the application were implemented.
Time on task is appropriate	X		Students remained constantly on task and engaged. Tutors provided positive encouragement when needed. Students transitioned easily from one worksheet or activity to the next.
	X		The instructors seemed aware of the students’ levels and what they were supposed to be working on. Instructors were able to keep students on task. In some cases, instructors used strategies to help

Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable			students come up with answers on their own or to help ensure that students understood concepts. On occasion, though, tutors gave students the answers or did not always check to make sure that students understood mistakes they may have made, or why their answers were wrong. Tutors seemed familiar with the Ace It! curriculum and with plans for each student.
Student/instructor ratio: <u>3:1</u>	X		Student/instructor ratio was lower than that described in the application (8:1 or lower).